

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/828,796	04/10/2001	Se June Hong	YOR9-2000-0732US1	YOR9-2000-0732US1 8405	
30743	7590 02/11/2005		EXAMINER		
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			POND, ROBERT M		
SUITE 340	·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA 20190			3625		
		•	DATE MAILED: 02/11/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action					
Before the Filing	of an Appeal Brief				

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/828,796	HONG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Robert M. Pond	3625		

Advisory Action	09/828,796	HONG ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert M. Pond	3625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
•		•				
<ul> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</li> <li>a) ☐ The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.7  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ worlded below or appended.	rill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</li> </ol>						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  13. Other:						
Prinary Examiner						
	Prin	ions Examin	er			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. The Applicant's arguments are based on un-supported subject matter not disclosed in the originally filed disclosure. Step 24 is an essential method element underlying the Applicant's arguments. Step 24 is a verifying step and the Applicant's treatment of this step in the originally filed disclosure is at best general in nature. The Examiner firmly believes that the essence of the Applicant's certification invention relies of verification of product claims by a supplier or manufacturer, yet the instant application itself offers less information on how this accomplished than the prior art cited in the final Office Action.